



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,802	05/18/2006	Etsuko Miyamoto	20060750A	9419
513 7590 10/16/2008 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021				
EXAMINER JOIKE, MICHELE K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1636				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/16/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/579,802

Applicant(s)

MIYAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

MICHELE K. JOIKE

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 113-122 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 113-116 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 117-122 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/18/06, 7/27/06
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group 251 in the reply filed on July 14, 2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that SEQ ID NO: 120 and 250 should be examined with the elected group, since SEQ ID NO: 121 and 251 are fragments of SEQ ID NO: 121 and 251, respectively. This is found persuasive, and SEQ ID NO: 120 and 250 will be examined with the elected group.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 13-116 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on July 14, 2008.

Claims 117-122 are examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 117 and 120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 117, a nucleic acid can hybridize under "a stringent condition." While, an example of a stringent condition is given in paragraph 175, there is no

Art Unit: 1636

concrete definition of stringent condition. There are many conditions that would qualify as a stringent condition since there is no guidance in the specification as to what causes a hybridization condition to be stringent. Therefore, the metes and bounds of the claim are unclear.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 117 and 120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant claims a protein, including deletion, substitution or addition of one or several amino acid residues and interacts with a c-Jun protein. The claims read on a broad genus of amino acid sequences.

The written description requirement for a genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, i.e. structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show applicants were in possession of the claimed invention. In the instant case, the specification does

Art Unit: 1636

not sufficiently describe a representative number of amino acid sequences by actual reduction to practice or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics.

Applicant claims the protein by function only, without any disclosed or known correlation between the elements and their function. The specification only provides teachings of proteins that interact with c-Jun. The specification does not teach how to modify those proteins and still allow for an interaction with c-Jun. The skilled artisan cannot envision a sufficient number of embodiments of the instant invention from the instant specification because the specification only discloses the SEQ ID NO, and not deletion, substitution or addition of one or several amino acid residues of the proteins, and still allow for interaction with - Jun.

The state of the art at the time of filing does not provide sufficient information on the subject to overcome the deficiencies of the instant specification. There is no description in the art that allows one to envision a representative number of modified proteins by disclosing structural or functional features of the proteins so that one of skill in the art could envision the claimed invention. Thus the skilled artisan cannot consult the art at the time of filing to envision a sufficient number of embodiments of the instant invention to see that the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus.

Neither the specification of the instant application or the state of the art at the time of filing teaches a structure-function relationship for a representative number of proteins, that contain a deletion, substitution or addition of one or several amino acid residues and interacts with a c-Jun protein. As a result, the

Art Unit: 1636

skilled artisan would not be able to envision the claimed invention. Therefore applicant has not satisfied the written description requirement to show the skilled artisan that they were in possession of the claimed genus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 117-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lopez-Egido et al in view of accession number K01347 (GFAP, SEQ ID NO: 250 and 120).

Art Unit: 1636

Lopez-Egido et al (Exp. Cell Res. 278: 175-183, 2002, especially pp. 175-178) teach methods for detecting an interaction between glial fibrillary acidic protein (GFAP) and menin. The methods include a yeast two-hybrid (figure 4) and a GST pull down (figure 1). In the GST pull down, GFAP is tagged with GST and then is incubated with menin to determine if an interaction has occurred. In this method, GFAP is the bait. However, they do not teach the actual sequence of GFAP.

Accession number K01347 (1993) teaches the nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 250, which encodes GFAP. The accession number also teaches the amino acid sequence of GFAP, SEQ ID NO: 120.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use SEQ ID NO: 250, or SEQ ID NO: 120, because the nucleotide sequence encodes GFAP, and SEQ ID NO: 120 is the GFAP amino acid sequence, and one of skill in the art would desire to use the known GFAP sequence. It would have been obvious to use the sequence in SEQ ID NO: 250 or SEQ ID NO: 120 because it encodes, or is, the same enzyme, and would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Given the teachings of the prior art and the level of the ordinary skilled artisan at the time of the applicant's invention, it must be considered, absent evidence to the contrary, that said skilled artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1636

Allowable Subject Matter

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHELE K. JOIKE whose telephone number is (571)272-5915. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on 571-272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michele K Joike, Ph.D./

Michele K Joike, Ph.D.
Examiner
Art Unit 1636

